Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/670,234	KOMURO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dean O. Takaoka	2817
All Participants:	Status of Application	n:
(1) <u>Dean O. Takaoka</u> .	(3)	
(2) Ronald A. Rudder.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>18 May 2005</u>	Time: <u>1:00p</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Note of the provide a brief description:		-
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 U.S.C. 103(a)		
Claims discussed: 2		
Prior art documents discussed: Whatmore et al., Barber		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief separate in the contraction of all issues. 	ion. The examiner will provide a parate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
	•	
	•	
·		
_ ·		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Ap	oplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was the position of the Examiner that claim 2 remained obvious over Whatmore et al. in view of Barber. Whatmore et al. shows the configuration of the resonator including lead out portions of the upper and lower electrodes where Barber (Fig. 2) teaches the ground electrode (42) is thicker than the resonant portion of the upper electrodes (40)(col. 6, lines 1,2), thus where the thickness of the ground lead of Barber, used in the structure of Whatmore et al. would comprise the structure in claim 2. It was agreed to cancel claim 2 by Examiner's amendment. It was confirmed that the date of the non-patent literature document "Thin Film Resonators" was May 5, 2001, as indicated on page 3 of the specification (and cover page of the NPL document) and thus would be initialed by the Examiner as being considered.